



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 7043 09/766,424 01/18/2001 Shmuel Shaffer 062891.0472 7590 **EXAMINER** 04/07/2005 Barton E. Showalter AL AUBAIDI, RASHA S Baker Botts L.L.P. PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT 2001 Ross Avenue Dallas, TX 75201-2980 2642

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/766,424	SHAFFER ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Rasha S AL-Aubaidi	2642

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 28 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attachement.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s)

1. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and have been found not persuasive.

On page 14 of the remarks, applicant argues that there is no suggestion or motivation anywhere in Bruno for the claimed limitation of "a bridged conference call would be converted to a point-to-point call". On one hand, Bruno does teach the conversion of an ongoing point-to-point conference call to a multiparty bridged conference call without disruption of the ongoing call (see col. 2, line 55). On the other hand, Bruno does not suggest converting/transferring a conference call between three or more clients to a point-to-point conference call if only two clients remain in the conference call.

Thus, Bruno teaches using "additional" resources (bridge) when needed, and obviously one should use less resources (direct point-to-point) connection when the additional resources are no longer needed.

Applicant's argument (page 14 of the remarks, last paragraph) that the above "modification" would make Bruno "inoperable" and "unsatisfactory" is not clearly understood. Bruno teaches going one way (from direct to a bridge) for a reason, and when the reason is removed, obviously, one should go back to the original direct connection. Therefore, this does <u>not</u> make Bruno "inoperable".

Regarding applicant's argument for claims 2 and 4, both Bruno and the claimed invention convert/transfer a direct point-to-point conference call to a bridge without disruption. One of ordinary skill would have to avoid any disruption by "reformatting" as described by Bruno or by "synchronization" as claimed by applicant. The critical issue is not to disrupt the conference call. The claimed "synchronization" reads on "reformatting" as taught by Bruno.

Conclusion

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rasha S. AL-Aubaidi whose telephone number is (571) 272-7481. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 4:30 Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ahmad F Matar, can be reached on (571) 272-7488. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Examiner

Rasha Al-Aubaidi

03/31/2005

AHMAD F. MATAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2500